

Question	Answer
Due to the upcoming Christmas and New Year's holidays, will the City please consider extending the responds deadline and make the new deadline to submit 5pm on January 10 <sup>th</sup> ?	Yes. We have extended the deadline to 1/10/23.
Has the City established a process, committee or similar structure which is responsible for the City's final decision on which programs will be implemented with the City's ARPA SLFRF? If so, can you please describe the structure which is in place and whether any third-parties are currently assisting the City in this process?	Yes. The City currently facilitates decisions through the Center for Economic Recovery (CER), which is composed of chiefs, directors, administration staff, and City Council staff. The CER is responsible for intake, review, revision, and selection of proposals that align with the Mayor's 10 strategic priorities and assisting the respective City staff needed to carry out proposals through the legislative and initial implementation processes.
Has the City already identified which programs it plans to implement utilizing the ARPA SLFRF? If so, will you please provide the number of projects which will require eligibility evaluation? If not, does the City know or have any estimate of the number of projects which may be subject to eligibility evaluation during the course of the engagement?	Eligibility is currently being assessed by another consultant, who will continue to do so. Their determinations of eligibility (and therefore the number of programs requiring evaluation) will be communicated with the selected consultant.
Do the City's plans include the implementation of any large volume grant programs for individuals, businesses or non-profits? If so:	Yes.
1. How many programs of this type are under consideration by the City and what is the approximately dollar amount of ARPA SLFRF which may be allocated to these programs?	Currently, there are 18 programs that have ARPA SLFR funds allocated for them, ranging from \$1.9M to \$35M, and not all of which need additional evaluation. There are a handful of programs under consideration for the next legislative session, but have not been decided. Consultants should expect programs to trend toward the higher end of the funding spectrum of the previous range.
2. Does the City plan to administer these programs directly or engage with third-party subrecipients to administer these programs (program development, application review, approval, payment and beneficiary monitoring and/or expenditure review)?	In most cases, the City will plan to engage third-party recipients to administer large programs. If/ when capacity allows, the City <i>may</i> undertake some program administration, but it should not be anticipated that the City will do this itself. The City would welcome a conversation about specifics with its short-listed finalists.

3. If the City plans to administer these programs itself, does the requested compliance or evaluation scope requested in the RFP include services related to any of the following: application review and/or recommendations, review or applicant or beneficiary expenditures, subrecipient/beneficiary monitoring?	Certain programs are being or may be administered by the City. The level of service requested for each will be case-by-case and depend on the final available suite of services from Applicant as well as the final details of each program. At present, the City generally does not expect its City-administered programs to need application review from Applicant, but such programs may benefit from the review of beneficiary expenditures and beneficiary monitoring.
4. If the City plans to administer these programs itself, does the City already have a tool or platform for the collection and processing of grant applications?	There may be existing tools within respective departments for grant applications; However, depending on the needs and nature of the grant application, new tools or platforms may be needed.
What accounting and/or finance software does the City currently use?	CGI Advantage Financial Management
Does the City have an existing system for the collection and analysis of ARPA SLFRF expenditures, program performance information and grantee/subrecipient/beneficiary data? If not, does the requested scope include the provision of such technology by the respondent?	The City can use the financial system to track expenditures but does not have a system in place to track program performance information and grantee/subrecipient/beneficiary data.
If known, what amount or percentage of the City's ARPA SLFRF does the City expect to spend directly (i.e. on City purchases, personnel or projects) v. the % expected disbursed to subrecipients and beneficiaries?	At this time, the City has spent most of what it plans to spend on itself. There are a small number of projects planned to be used for internal, City use, but most of the ARPA SLFR Funds going forward will be spent on subrecipients and beneficiaries.
Will the City consider an alternative professional services fee proposal?	Yes.
Are RFP goals for participation by Cleveland small businesses and/or woman/minority owned businesses?	Yes, there is a 10% CSB goal on this project
Will the City accept a WBE or MBE certified by another government entity instead of a CSB?	The Office of Equal Opportunity will not give credit for the use of MBE or FBE firms as subconsultants in lieu of the use of CSB subconsultants. If a Proposer is unable to utilize certified CSB firms in its proposal, but is using certified MBE and/or FBE firms, the Proposer should document this along with other good faith efforts as an attachment to OEO Schedule 4.

Does the City have a budget for this project? If so, can the City share it?	We have funding set aside for this project. However, we would prefer that the Consultants build out their budgets according to their needs rather than providing the budget. If the proposal exceeds our budget, we will work with the Consultant upon selection.
Has the City contracted for services related to the CARES Act, ARPA or other Pandemic Relief programs? If so, can the City provide the names of the consultant(s)?	Yes. The City currently has a contract with Bricker & Eckler LLP for legislative/ legal compliance. The City also contracts with a handful of nonprofits and organizations for the administration of some ARPA programs, which can be provided.
Has the City developed any programmatic outcomes related to the ARPA funds or will the consultant need to design programmatic outcomes to recommend to the City?	While the City has a general sense of desired programmtic outcomes, we are seeking the consultant to assist with and narrowly focus outcomes, which will inform program design.
Does the City have any written policies or procedures for the administration of ARPA funds?	The City does not have policies or procedures specific to administering ARPA funds beyond those required under federal, state, and local law.
For the Fee Proposal, can the consultants provide hourly rates instead of total compensation? (The scope of the services are not clearly defined in order to determine total compensation.)	Whether the respondent provides an hourly rate structure or some other form of fee proposal, the City will need to be able to estimate the total cost of the engagement. So, for example, if a respondent provides a blended hourly rate for work done as part of this proposal, then the City would expect that the respondent would indicate its estimate of how many hours an evaluation of an ARPA-funded initiative would take.
If wants total compensation in the Fee Proposal, can the City please provide all proposers the same assumed level of effort in hours for appropriate comparison of fees?	The City is not in a position to determine the level of effort for each respondent. Given the diverse array of potential respondents and, thus, business models, the City will rely on each respondent to indicate its expected level of effort.
Will you please provide clarity regarding Scope of Services requirement Part 2, Phase 1, number 1.c.i. which requires that “Dashboards and underlying data may not be proprietary to the Consultant and must be always accessible by Urban AI staff”? Does the City have an expectation of how this will the City expects this requirement to be met or will it accept any of the following to meet this requirement?	City prefers Option A or Option C. The City intends to use and maintain the dashboards into the future, City requests access to modify or adjust the dashboards, not just view and download data. The City has data staff with analytics experience (Tableau, Power BI) who can receive the dashboards.
a. Dashboards and related data are hosted on City systems, with access to develop and update information provided to the selected contractor.	

b. Dashboards and related data are hosted on the selected contractor systems:	
i. With read only access provided to the City	
ii. With read access and the ability to download underlying data provided to the City	
c. Dashboards and related data are hosted in a shared folder, accessible to both the selected contractor and the City (such as a SharePoint site)	
d. Dashboards and data are provided to the City and Urban AI staff on an agreed upon schedule through other delivery means (such as email, secured transfer, etc.)	
Related to the above question, does the City expect that any of the data and visualizations will also be provided or made available publically, outside of the expectation that they may be used for internal City reporting, as part of updates to City Administration and Elected Officials or as a component or input the City's annual ARPA SLFRF reports?	Yes, City expects dashboards and/or content within dashboards will be used for all purposes listed including being made publically available and included in the ARPA SLFRF reports.